(1)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

APR 25 2003

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

CASE 03..34

IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

2003 TERM

ROYAL DEMOCRATIC STATES OF CONTINENTAL AFRICA GOVERNMENT ; KING WILLIAM LORD PUNCHARD; (EDMOUND RIGHT ROYAL CONSUL; MICHEL CONTRERES ROYAL CONSUL)
PETITIONERS,

V,

THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO; (GOVERNOR GARRY JOHNSON; THE 2ND JUDICIAL DISTRICT JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF NEW MEXICO; THE NEW MEXICO CORRECTION CENTER OF NEW MEXICO; 12TH JUDICIAL CITY MAGISTRATE)
RESPONDENTS.

<<

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. U.S. District Court made a disposition ,dening Federal Jurisdiction TO Foreign agents for a Writ of Habeas Corpus , in direct conflict with the Exclusive Doctrine held by U.S. Constitution, Article III., Section 2., Paragraph (Foreign Ministers , and State Conflicts),and Supreme Court RULE 10 (C) (....BUT SHOULD BE).

QUESTION

1. Will the Court Reverse the DC"s final Disposition Against Writ of Habeas Corpus,Pursuant to the Doctrine of none delegation (no Final Jurisdictional Statutes in Foreign Diplomatic and State Conflicts) ?

2. The Defendant Appellee Refuse to Release Foreign Government Agents having diversity citizenship, in 10 years, make no Timely Federal Court File of a Diplomatic Conflict where State is a Part ,it Circumventing Federal Constitution, Article III., Section 2., Paragraph 2.(Doctrine of Exclusive Jurisdiction by the U.S. Supreme Court).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

QUESTION

2. Will the Court Grant the Writ of Habeas Corpus?

QUESTION

2 (B) Will Court denie State Claims of 11 Amendment Rights to Circumvent over U.S. Court's Exclusive Jurisdiction given under Constitutional Article III,?

<>

3. Defendant –Appellee(City court) continues hurassment, abuse Power and discretion with act of State Terrorism against Plaintiff-Appellant's Government Embassy Staff and Property, In spite of Diplomatic Statutes and Diversity of Citizenship Notices.

QUESTION

4. Will the Court Order the Defendant-Appellee to stop his Actions against the Plaintiff-Appellant and his Foreign Government ?

QUESTION

4(A). Will the original requested amount ($)of Compensation ($)be Granted the Plaintiff-Appellant ?

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

5. The U.S. State Department Letter to the Plaintiff Appellant is about the latest correspondence concerning International affairs. This Letter about Peace talks in the Sudan region is offered to show that their is a Citizenship diversity that Plaintiff-Appellant and his Government Agents, Have; and a Foreign Government interest of the Plaintiff-Appellant , that is recognized by the U.S. State Department.

QUESTION

5. Will the Honorable Court accept this EXHIBIT D) (App-4., and APP 7)as Presented Evidence Support for The Federal Rules of Evidence, RULE 902 3.(B) (Self-Authentication) Diversity Citizenship and Sovereignty Statutes?

QUESTION

6. Will the Court order the release of Plaintiff Appellant's Government Agent with out any more Delay?

(0)

INDEX

QUESTION PRESENTED..... i. & ii & 0

INDEX.....00

CASE PRESIDENCE.....iii

FEDERAL CODE.....iii

FEDERAL RULE.....iii

CONSTITUTION.....iii

PARTYS.....4.

JURISDICTION STATEMENTS.....5

FOUNDATIONS & QUESTIONS.....1.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY.....11., 12.

STATEMENTS OF THE CASE .....13., 15.

ARGUMENTS.....16./,17., 18.

CONCLUSIONS.....19., 20.

EXHIBIT A.....U.S. APPEALS.COURT....App 1., APP 2.
EXHIBIT B.....RULE 902. 3(B).....App 4.,

EXHIBIT B.a.....RULE 901(7).....APP 5.
EXHIBIT C.....U.S. Constitution.....APP 6.

EXHIBIT D U.S. Department of State APP 7 & APP 8.

CASE PRESEDENTS

Newman-Green, Inc, V, Alfronzo-Larrain, 490 U.S.826,828 (1989).....15.,

Kiowa Indian Tribe of Okla., V, Hoover,150 F .3d 1163, 1169 (10thCir.1998).....14., 17.,

United States , v, Belmont Bank 301, Us 324 (1937) 17,

FEDERAL CODE

Federal Neutrality Act (State Terrorism).....18.,

28 U.S.C. 1332 (a) (Citizenship Diversity Jurisdiction)..1., ...1., 2., 3., 5., 16., 18.

28 U.S.C.1251 (lack of Jurisdiction).....17., 18.

FEDERAL RULE

Federal Rule of Evidence, RULE 902 .3(self-Authornication) 11., 15.,

Federal Rule of Evidence , RULE 901(7) (Public Record). 2., 3., 12.,

Federal Rule 4 (Mail Service).....12.

CONSTITUTIONAL ARTICLE

Constitutional, article III.,Section 2.,Paragraph 2.(Exclusive Jurisdiction).....1., 2., 4., 13., 14., 17.

Constitutional, 14th amendment (Equal Protection). .....(*)

Constitutional , 6th Amendment (Right to Counsel).....18.

LIST OF PARTIES

PETITIONORS, ROYAL DEMOCRATIC STATES OF CONTINENTAL AFRICA GOVERNMENT;
HIS MAJESTIE WILLIAM LORD PUNCHARD
(COUNSUL AGENT EDMOUND WRIGHT;
CONSUL AGENT MICHEL CONTRERES).
ROYAL CONTINENTAL AFRICA EMBASSY #15
702 WEST FIRST STREET
DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030 u.s.a.
(505) 546-9473

<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

RESPONDENTS, GOVERNOR GARRY JOHNSON
TONY F. ORTIZ, JR
CASTILLE LAW FIRM
P.O. BOX 1339
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544

<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO
PEGGIE JEFFERS WIKLE
Assistance attorney General
P.O. Drawer1508
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87504
(505) 827-6000

Appellet History

This Plaintiff-Government has never been before the U.S. U.S. Supreme Court in this combination of a Complaint, in it's Government's Political Name with this Matter.

However' there has been Subjects and Members of the Government before the Supreme Court with this Matter.

District Court dismiss on.....Sept.,3,2002...BB/KBM
Appeals Court dismiss on 01/27/2003.....

<>

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

This court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Constitutional, Article III, Section 2., Paragraph 2.; Federal Neutrality Act; the constitutional , Article VII , 14 th Amendment ; 6th amendment ; the 13th Amendment Bill of Rights; the Federal Code 28 U.S.C. Sect. And 28 U.S.C. 1983, 1332 (a); the Federal Rule of Evidence , RULE 902. (3.b), and RULE 901(7) , this Court has exclusive Jurisdiction herein.

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

The Plaintiff-Petitioner in this case certify that a copy of this Court Complaint was served on the Defendant-Appellees on this date 4/23 / 2003, at the their Address of Work Place

William Lord Punchard Pro Se Counsel
William Lord Punchard Pro Se Counsel.

MOTION TO PETITION PRO HAC VICE

PLAINTIFF-PETITIONER Motion to the U.S. Supreme Court for permission to Petition their Jurisdiction for the right to file this "Writ ",and "Writ of Habeas Corpus" with the presence of the Honorable Court, pursuant Pro Hac Vice to Rule 6.(Argument by Brief.)

Plaintiff has a Doctor of Jurisprudence Degree in International Law.

Having no more Business before the Honorable Court Plaintiff-Petitioner thanks the Honorable court.

4/23/2003 William Lord Punchard

William Lord Punchard Pro Se Counsel

PRECEDURAL HISTORY

Federal District and Federal Court of Appeal has sided with the Defendant (State Court)and refused to Grant Plaintiff-Petitioner's request for a Protective Order against Defendant's State Violations of Plaintiff's Government Embassy Staff and Property Jurisdiction.. At the same time , failure to allow Petitionre's Foreign Subject Diversity Jurisdictional Statutes to enter Federal Court for Writ of Habeas Corpus , The U.S. District Court made Light of the Diversity Statutes, and attempting to Support State Defendant -Appellees. The U.S. District Court Ordered a Blocking of Plaintiff's Right to Federal Subpoena for transfer of the State Court **Record Proper** as required Pursuant to Federal Rule 81.1.(U.S. District Court). The Defendant-Appellee Record Proper would have **reflected State Terrorism By Defendant- Appellee. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence, RULE 902(3) Embassy Identification of Consul Agents are in the State Record Proper**

PRECEDURAL HISTORY

pursuant to RULE 4.) The Plaintiff –Petitioner Diversity of Citizenship Jurisdiction quilify him to Request for a Writ of Habeas Corpus Pursuant to the U.S. Superme Court RULE 10 (C).

(B) Plaintiff-Petitioner and Embassy Staff Live on the Foreign Government Embassy owned Property , and Jurisdiction, and have so for 19 .8 Years. Pursuant to U.S. Federal Rules of Evidence, RULE 901 (7) (Public Record).

(C) Plaintiff-Petitioner's Motioned the U.S. District Court for a Protective Court Order against the Defendant-Appellee (Beaes ,City Court). The U.S. District Court again made **Folly** of the request for a Protective Order. Active Arrogant State Terrorism is no joke, and dangerous to this Government So' this Plaintiffs Petition the American U.S. Supreme Court

STATEMENTS OF THE CASE

1. Attempted Jurisdiction take over Plaintiff-Petitioner's Foreign Government, was a violation of the Federal Neutrality Act. The Plaintiff being harmed by the Defendant (State) Terrorism (False-Imprisonment) Actions, and Due Process Protection , and Relief for the Plaintiff is over Due.

2. U.S. District Court, and U.S. Court of Appeals failed to notice the Complaint's Captions (Political), qulifily Federal Jurisdiction, and removes The Doctrine of Disposition from the U.S. District Court.

3. Is the Federal District Court, and the U.S. Appeals Court Suffering from the Doctrine of None-Delegation : No Jurisdiction to Make any Political Foreign Policy for Constitutional , Article III., Section 2., Paragraph 2. Litigation qulifications.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

4. Defendant-appellee claim the 11 Amendment Right, `and Jurisdiction over the Case. The **Rooker-Feldman** Doctrine that Bars a Losing Party from Seeking review in U.S. District Court, **but'**is Bared' by the Constitutional , Article III., Section 2., Paragraph 2.(Foreign Ministers), (Exclusive Jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court).

PLEASE SEE: Kiowa Indian Tribe of Okla. V, Hoover, 150 F .3d 1163, 1169 (10thCir.1998)

5. District Court aboused his discretion by attempted to make a Political, and Medical Disposition. Pursuant to Constitution, Article III, Section 2., Paragraph 2. The District Court's Disposition to Denie Jurisdiction should be stricken down. Only the Supreme Court has that Exclusive(Medical or Political) Disposition Rights Nationally. **PLEASE SEE: (EXHIBIT E), Constitution.**

6. The Plaintiff-Petitioner being a Foreign Government

STATEMENTS OF THE CASE

Agent , and living in a Publicly Posted Foreign Government Embassy, and has a deferent Diversity Citizenship from Defendant-appellees.. Satifying the Rooker-Feldman Doctrine .....*1. The State of New Mexico Jurisdiction do not extend in to this Foreign Embassy Jurisdiction. *2. Defendant-Appellee(Johnson) lives in the same Jurisdiction as Defendant-Appellee(state).**PLEASE SEE: Newman-Green ,Inc. V, Alfonzo-Larrain** 490 U.S. 826, 828.**(1989).**

◇

7. The U.S. Federal Code 28 U.S.C. 1332(A) acknowledge that Subject of a Foreign State as Diversity. Federal Rules of Evidence, RULE 902, (3.B) POINTS OUT THAT Foreign Embassy Staff Identification of Agents is applicable. **PLEASE SEE: (EXHIBIT B).**

◇

8. U.S. District Court Blocked Petitioner's Subpoenaing of the Defendant-Appellee's State Court Record Proper(DC Rule 81.1) from being showing to the U.S. Supreme Court.,

ARGUEMENTS FOR GRANTING

1. Pursuant to Federal Code 28 U.S. C. 1332(a) Diversity of Jurisdiction Statutes may be employed because the Plaintiff-Petitioners qualify here in as a *1. A Foreign State...and is a Plaintiff. *2. Subject of a Foreign State. This can be viewed on the first Page of the Federal District Court Complaint. Plaintiff has the Diversity Statutes neede for Federal Jurisdiction. **Please See: Federal Code 28 U.S.C. 1332(A).**

<>

2. The U.S. District Court Errored in its Discretion to Attempt to remove Federal Jurisdiction Because ' he suffers from the Doctrine of None-Delegation (No Jurisdiction to make **final** Political (Federal) Disposition). Concerning a discrepancy between a State, and Plaintiff-Petitioner Minister of a Foreign State (Constitutional, Article III., Section 2., Paragraph 2. (Foreign Ministers). The Supreme Court Should Grant the Writ of Habeas Corpus . **Please See: (EXHIBIT E)**

ARGUEMENTS FOR GRANTING

3. The Plaintiff-Petitioner lives in a Foreign Government Embassy Jurisdiction that is Publicly Displayed , and the Embassy Property is Recorded So . Plaintiff-Petitioner Political Statutes don't allow him to loose in a Foreign Political State Court. Therefor ' the Defendant-Appellee Claim to the 11 Amendment , and Jurisdiction over this Case is Moot, and can not be Employed against Constitutional Article III. District Court should be reversed.

Please See: Kiowa Indian Tribe of Okla. V, Hoover, 150F #d 1163, 1169 (10th Cir. (1998)

4. The Defendant-Appellee's unreasonable , and untimely delay in making a Application to a Federal Jurisdiction in a Constitutional ,**Article III Class Discrepancy** with the Plaintiff-Petitioner's Consul Agents Constitute *1. Failure to grant a Speedy Trial, *2. Violations of the Doctrine of involuntary servitude;

Please See: (EXHIBIT E).

ARGUEMENTS FOR GRANTING

5. The U.S. District Court assessment of Plaintiff Petitioner's complaint (as to intent) is not held in the same light with in the International Community (International Court of Justice) in which the Plaintiff –Petitioner herein is a Charged Office . U.S. District Court attempted Disposition Comments failed to Address the Legal Process of the Complaint; therefore' Courts Disposition should be viewed **Malpractice (Lack of Due Process)** by his Owen words, and **Reversed** for lack of Exhibits to Support his Conclusions. **Please See: (EXHIBIT A)**

<>

6. State Court don't have a Federal Jurisdiction to appoint defense Counsel that is paid by the State Court in a foreign Political State, v, State Case. Failure to allow a Federal Jurisdiction to a Foreign Government Consul Agent is a Violation of the Federal Neutrality Act. and violating Code 28 U.S.C. 1332(A).Diversity Doctrine, with State Terrorism. It's Timely to Grant the **Writ of Habeas Corpus.**

CONCLUSIONS

Other than Acting Judicially Unprofessional with his descriptions, and folly at the person of the Plaintiff-Petitioner, the U.S. District Court abused the Court discretion. He knew and had reason to know that the Petitioner has Diversity Citizen Statutes. The constitutional Article III, do not require the U.S. District Judge to regulate, nor Final Disposition , nor Screen partys having intent to comply with obviously the U.S. Supreme Court , RULE 10(c). The State Defendant and U.S. Appeal Court Suffers from the Doctrine of None-Delagation(no Jurisdiction to Politically Disposition). Granting the Writ of Habeas Corpus relief of the two Consul Agents is the Proper thing to do. Diversity Statutes held by the Plaintiff-Petition should have accessibility to the U.S. Supreme Courts less the American Constitution deprivation sat in for the lack of Rule of law . Pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence, RULE 902 (3.B) All of the Plaintiffs-Petitioner Consul Agent have Diversity

CONCLUSIONS

Jurisdiction. The District Court Blocked the transfering of the State Court Record Proper. (DC 81.1). this was a obstruction of Justice by the District Court attempting to deprive the Counsul Agents of Due Process of LAW. The Writ relief was due with in the First Minute the Defendant-Appellee (State) received a Notice of Political Agency from the Plaintiff-Petitioner's Government Embassy. Pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence , Rule 902 (3.B) each Defendant-Appellee had a Notice of Diversity Statutes delivered to them Pursuant to DC Rule 4. Service. Terms of time (40 Years) of False Imprisonment of Government Diplomats is Out Ragious Conduct Expressed as a State Terrorism. This will be the Second time the Plaintiff has attempted to gain the Freedom of it's Diplomats. This Matter is begaining to lay heavy on International Friendly Relations. We want relief.

. The Granting of the Writ of Habeas Corpus is Consistant with National Justice , and Right, and will not Prejudice the Defendant-Appellee in any way,

04/22/2003 William Lord Punchard

WILLIAM LORD PUNCHARD,PRO SA CONSEL

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

KING WILLIAM LORD PUNCHARD, Royal Democratic States Of Continental Africa Government,(Edmound Right , royal consul: Micheal contreres, Royal consul).

Plaintiff,

Vs, No. CIV 02-780 bb/KBM

State of New Mexico ,Governor Gary Johnson;(2nd Judicial District court of new Mexico ; 12nd Judicial District Court of New Mexico ;New Mexico State Corrections Department); the Deming City Magistrate Ray Baesa,

Defendants.

ORDER DISMISSING CASE

This matter came before the Court on motions to dismiss filed by several Defendants (docs.16.,18). Plaintiff has filed an initial pleading "Petition for arrest of Judgment and Writ of Habeas Corpus", which has been treated as a Complaint. In the Petition, Plaintiff claims to be the head of State of a Non-existent country, the Royal Continental Africa Government. Plaintiff also claim that two Individuals incarcerated in New Mexico Prisons are Diplomats employed by this Non-Existent Country. And are entitled to diplomatic immunity. He therefore request habeas corpus relief on behalf of those individuals. In addition, Plaintiff requests relief from "harassment " by the Deming"City Magistrate Court". Which is allegedly mailing "Hurassing Court Summjons" To the Royal Embassy." These Summons apparently concern a Citationand $167 fine assessed upon Plaintiff by the Deming Municipal Judge, for maintaining unsanitary Permises(Classic Car Collection). Exh. B,Plf. Motion for directed Verdict).

Dismissal of this case is warranted for a number of reasons. As to the Habeas Corpus aspect for the Petition, seeking reliease of the two Inmatees who are allegedly Consul or Diplomats of Plaintiff,s non-existent country , the allegations of the petition are fanciful and delusional , and this court may dismiss on that basis *See,eg,Dekoven v, bell.2001* W l 1450702 (6th Cir.)(complaint alleging that plaintiff was the true messiah was

delusional, frivolous, and properly dismissed). As to Plaintiff's attempt to attack the Deming Municipal Court's judgment as well as its jurisdiction over him . Plaintiff's petition is also delusional to the extent it is based on his contention that the Municipal court has no jurisdiction over his property , which he styles the Royal Embassy. Furthermore , this court dose not sit as a Appellate Court reversing judgments entered by state courts. Plaintiff's proper avenue for obtaining relief is in the state court system, not here.

Based on the foregone , this Court finds there is no federal jurisdiction this case and the case will dismissed. The Court notes that Plaintiff has filed Several other Frivolous Law suits and several frivolous appeals to the Tenth Circuits *See E.,G Punchard V, Luna county comm'n 98 CIV !47(D.N.M.)(case includes order imposing filing restrictions on Plaintiff. DUE to frivolous nature of his Pleadings* Plaintiff is warned that further frivolous Litigation will lead to more serious sanctions. Possibly including financial penalties under Rule !!, or restrictions from filing any Pro Se Complaints in this District.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this case be, and hereby is . DISMISSED with Prejudice.

DATE September 3 2002

BRUCE D. BLACK
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

(APP-000)

(EXHIBIT A)

FILED
United States Court of Appeals
Tenth Circuit
Jan 27 2003
PATRIC FISHER
Clerk

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
TENTH CIRCUIT

WILLIAM LORD PUNCHARD, King, Royal Democratic State of Continental Africa Government ;.(Edmound Right, Royal Consul; Michel Contreres, Royal consul),		
Plaintiff- Appellant,		
V,		
		No. 02-2275
STATE OF NEW MEXICO; GARRY JOHNSON, Governor; 2nd JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT NEW MEXICO; 12TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF NEW MEXICO ; NEW MEXICO STATE CORRECTIONS DEPARTMENT; DEMING CITY MAGISTRATE COURT,		D.C. NO. CIV-02-780 BB/KBM (D. New Mexico)
Defendant-Appellees.		

ORDER AND JUDGEMENT

Before KELLY, McKAY, AND MURPHY, Circuit Judges

This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata and collateral estoppel. The court generally disfavors the citation of orders and judgements; nevertheless, an order and judgment may be cited under the terms and conditions of 10th cir. R. 36.3.

(EXHIBIT A.)

After examining the briefs and appellate record, this panel has determined unanimously that oral argument would not materially assist the determination of this appeal. See Fed.R.App.P.34(a)(2); 10th Cir.R.34.1(G). The case is therefore ordered submitted with out oral argument.

William Punchard, proceeding Pro Se., appeals the district court" dismissal of his action for lack of federal jurisdiction. In his filings before the district court, Punchard alleged that he is the head-of State of a non-Existent country and that two diplomats employed by his "country" are being Illegally incarcerated in New Mexico State Prison; Punchard requested habeas relief on behalf of these two individuals, Punchard further alleged that he was being harassed by the Deming, New Mexico "City Magistrate Court " which is allegedly mailing "Harassing court Summons" to his Royal Embassy . " in Dismissing this action , the district court concluded that Punchard's allegations were so fanciful and delusional that they failed to invoke the Federal question jurisdiction.

This court has thoroughly reviewed all of the numerous documents filed by Punchard in this appeal and has reviewed De Novo the District court's order of dismissal and the entire record on appeal. That review demonstrates that the District Court's resolution of the case was substantially correct. Accordingly, this court Affirm the district court's dismissal, This complaint is dismissed.

Entered for the court,

(EXHIBIT B)

Rule 902. Self-authentication

Estrinsic evedence of authenticity as a condition precedent to Admisaibility is not required with respect to the following:

(1)Domestic public documents under seal.__A Document bearing a seal purporteing to be that of the United States, or of an State, District, commonwealth, territory , or insular possession thereof, or the Panama canal Zone, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, or of a political subdivision, Department, officer, or agency thereof, and a signature pur-Proting to be an attestation or execution.

(2) Domestic Public Documents not under seal.....

(3) Foreign Public documents.__A document purporting to Be executed or attested in his official capacity by a person authorized by the laws of a foreign country t o make the execu tion or attestation, and accompanied by a final certification as to the genuineness of the signature and official position

(A) of the executing or attesting person, or (B) of any foreign official whose certificate of genuineness of signature and official position relates to the execution or attestation or is in a chain of certificates of genuineness of signature and official position relating to the execution or attestation, A final Certification may be made by a Secretary of embassy or legation, consul general, vice consul, or consular agent of the United States , or a diplomatic or consular official of the foreign country assigned or accredited to the united States. If reasonable opportunity has been given to all parties to investigate the authenticity and accuracy of official documents, the court may , for good cause shown, order that they be treated as presumptively authentic without final certification or permit them to be evidenced by an attested summary with or with final certification.

(EXHIBIT B.a)

ARTICLE .AUTHENTICATION AND IDENTIFICATION

Rule 901. Requirement of authentication or Identification

(a) General provisions-The requirement of authentication or Identification as a condition precedent to admissibility is datisfied By evidence sufficient to support a finding that the matter in Question is what its proponent claim .

(b) Illustrations.-By way of illustration only, and not by way Of limitation, the following are examples of authentication or Identification conforming with the requirements of this rule:

(1) Testimony of witness with knowledge._Testimony that A matter is what it is claimed to be .

(2) Nonexpert opinion on handwriting.__Nonexpert opinion As to the genuineness of handwriting, based upon familiarity Not acquired for purposes of the litigation.

(3) Comparison by trier or expert witness.__Comparison by the trier of fact or by expert witnesses with speciment which have been authenticated.

(4) Distinctive characteri ics and the like.__Appearance, contents, substance, internal patterns, or other distinctive characteristics, taken in conjunction with circumstances.

(5)Voice identification.__Identification of a voice, whether heard firsthand or through mechanical of electronic transmission or recording, by opinion based upon hearing the voice at the time under circumstances connecting it with the alleged speaker.

(6) Telephone conversations.__Telephone conversations, by evidence that a call was made to the number assigned at the time by the telephone company to a particular person or business, If (A) in the case of a person, circumstances, including self-identification, show the person answering to be the one called, or(B) in the case of a business, and the call was made to a place of business and the conversation related to business reasonably transacted over the telephone.

(7) Public records or reports.__Evidence that a writing authorized by law to be recorded or filed and fact recorded or filed in a public office, or a purported public record, report, statement, or data compilation, in any form, is from the public office where items of this nature are kept.

(8) Ancient Documents.....(9) Process or system.....(10) Methods.....Statuteor rule._....any Methods of authentication or Identification provided by act of congress or by othe rule..... Perscribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to Statutory author..

(EXHIBIT E)

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION , ARTICLE III

Section 2, :

(1) The judicial Power shall extend to all cases, in law and Equity , arising under this constitution, the Laws of the United States , and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority;--to all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other Public Ministers and Consul;-to all Cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction;-to controversies to which the United States shall be a Party ;-to controversies between two or more States;-between a state and a citizens of another state ;-between citizen of different States,-between citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States, and between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and Foreign States, Citizens or Subjects.

(2) In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consul , and those in which a State Shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction, In all the other Cased before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.

(APP 6)

(EXHIBIT D)

United states Department of State

Washington ,D.C. 20520, April 29, 2003

Dear Mr, Punchard:

The White House has asked me to respond to your letter to President Bush about Sudan.

The administration shares your concerns for the people of Sudan who have suffered aerial bombings, slave raiding, forced displacement, and religious persecution as a result of the 20-year conflict. We believe the opportunity to end these human tragedies is possible by securing a just and lasting peace.

We are encouraged by the peace negotiations in Kenya between the warring parties: the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement /army (SPLM;/A). Both parties signed an agreement in October 2002 to cease hostilities and allow unimpeded humanitarian access to all areas of Sudan. As a result, aerial bombardment has ceased, fighting has been reduced, and some previously unreachable areas are now receiving food aid.

Sudan's president omer Hassan Ahmed El-Bashir and SPLM/A leader John Garang met April 2,2003, in Kenya and affirmed their commitment to a peace agreement and expressed their hope for the conclusion of an agreement in June 2003. Negotiations are ongoing. Building upon the critical July 20, 2002 Peace Protocol that resolved the role of religion and the State and the South's right of self-determination, We will continue to work diligently with regional partners to help both sides conclude a just and comprehensive peace agreement.

Mr. William Lord Punchard, 702 West First street, Deming, NM 88030

(APP 7)

In support of the peace talks , the U.S. established a Civilian Protection Monitoring Team (CPTM) to investigate attacks on Civilians. The CPMT is helping the peace process by highlighting atrocities, keeping both sides accountable to their word, and recommending concrete action both sides can take to avoid further attacks.

The president signed the Sudan Peace Act into Law on October 21, and the Administration is actively engaged in realizing its goal, a just and lasting peace of all the people of Sudan. Consistent with the Sudan Peace Act, the President made a determination on April 21 . 2003, that the parties to the conflict were negotiating in good faith and that the negotiations should continue . For further information on this determination, We refer you to the Sudan Page on the Department of State/s Web Site : (www. State. gov)

Sincerely,

Ambassador Michael
Ranneberger
Special Advisor for Sudan
Bureau of African Affairs

(APP 8)